

Serial Number: 09/735,025

Docket Number: 10002627-1

REMARKS

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1, 3, 6-8, 10, 13-15, 17, 20-22, 24-27, 29-32, and 34-36 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 27, and 32 have been amended. Applicant requests reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

In item 1 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 6-8, 10, 13-15, 17, and 20-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US Published Patent Application 2001/0052910 A1 filed by Parekh et al. (hereafter "Parekh"). Anticipation under §102 "requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under construction. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). In view of the amendments presented herein, Applicants assert that Parekh fails to show or suggest each of the elements of claims 1, 3, 6-8, 10, 13-17, and 20-21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

To begin, claim 1 has been amended to provide as follows:

1. A system for generating a graphical user interface (GUI), comprising:
 - a processor circuit having a processor and a memory;
 - GUI generation logic stored on the memory and executable by the processor, the GUI generation logic comprising:
 - logic to find at least one section in a template, the section being identified by a pair of section tags and a plurality of input items nested between the section tags, each of the input items being identified by input field tags;
 - logic to generate at least one section heading to be displayed in the graphical user interface in association with the at least one section, the at least one section heading comprising text of the section tags;
 - logic to generate an input field in the graphical user interface for each one of the input items, the input fields being generated in association with the at least one section heading; and
 - logic to automatically generate a label to be displayed in the graphical user interface for each of the input fields with an input field tag text of an associated one of the input field tags in the template.

As set forth in claim 1 above, the section heading that is generated comprises the tag text of section tags in a template. The section heading is generated to be displayed in a graphical user interface in association with the at least one section. Thus, the actual tag text of section tags is displayed in the graphical user interface.

Serial Number: 09/735,025

Docket Number: 10002627-1

Similarly, claim 1 provides for generating a label that is to be displayed in the graphical user interface, where the label comprises an input field tag text of associated input field tags in the template.

Applicants assert that Parekh fails to show or suggest the display of the actual tag text of tags as headings or labels in a graphical user interface displayed on a display device. Specifically, Figure 1 of Parekh does not show a graphical user interface and it does not show how text from section tags and input field tags is used as labels in the graphical user interface.

Also, in Paragraph 94 cited in the Office Action, Parekh specifically states:

"[0094] Attributes—this keyword is used when defining syntax to represent zero or more attributes within a tag. For example, the <INPUT> tag has the attributes TYPE, NAME, VALUE, SIZE, MAXLENGTH, CHECKED, and ALIGN. The general syntax for it would be <TAG Attributes> ("<TAG Attributes> text" if text is to follow to tag as is in the case of <INPUT TYPE="radio">). This is mapped into Syntax2 in the "Supported Syntax" section."

Applicant asserts that this section says nothing about whether an attribute in a tag is to be used for labeling an input field. Rather, this excerpt only describes "Attributes" as a keyword that is understood by a "Screen Template Generator", not that the actual text of a tag is used as a label in a graphical user interface as claimed.

Thus, Parekh fails to show or suggest each of the elements of claim 1 as amended herein. In addition, Applicants assert that Parekh fails to show or suggest each of the elements of claims 8 and 15 as amended to the extent that such claims include subject matter similar in scope with that of claim 1 as amended. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1, 8, and 15 be withdrawn. In addition, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 3, 6-7, 10, 13-14, 17, and 20-21 be withdrawn as depending from claims 1, 8, or 15, respectively.

In item 2 of the Office Action, claims 22, 24-27, 29-32, and 34-36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Parekh. Anticipation under §102 "requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under construction. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Also, a prima facie case of obviousness is established only when the prior art teaches or suggests all of the elements of the claims. MPEP §2143.03,

Serial Number: 09/735,025

Docket Number: 10002627-1

In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 28 U.S.P.Q2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In view of the amendments to claims 22, 27, and 32, Applicants assert that Parekh fails to show or suggest each of the elements of claims 22, 24-27, 29-32, and 34-36.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

In particular, claim 22 has been amended to recite as follows:

22. A system for generating a graphical user interface (GUI), comprising:
a processor circuit having a processor and a memory;
GUI generation logic stored in the memory and executable by the processor, the GUI generation logic comprising:
logic to identify an input item with a default value in a template, the template representing a document in a markup language file;
logic to generate the graphical user interface from the template that displays the document as the document appears when printed with an input field included within the document, the input field being associated with the input item, and the default value being initially displayed in the input field;
logic that associates a format attribute with the input item; and
logic to associate input checking logic with the graphical user interface, the input checking logic determining whether data entered into the input field conforms to a required data format specified by the format attribute.

As set forth above, claim 22 recites a format attribute associated with the input item, and input checking logic associated with the graphical user interface that determines whether data entered into an input field conforms to a required data format specified by the format attribute.

Parekh describes an automated system for creating and customizing screen displays for interactively presenting a sequence of customer dialogues using various template files. However, Parekh does not show or suggest associating input checking logic with a graphical user interface that checks the data entered into various input fields associated with the graphical user interface to determine whether such inputs conform with required data formats specified by a format attribute associated with an input item as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 22 be withdrawn. In addition, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 27 and 32 be withdrawn to the extent that they have been amended to incorporate subject matter similar in scope with that of claim 22. Also, Applicants request that the rejection of

Serial Number: 09/735,025Docket Number: 10002627-1

claims 24-26, 29-31, and 34-36 be withdrawn as depending from claims 22, 27, or 32.

Finally, it is noted that claims 1, 8, and 15 have also been amended so as to provide for proper antecedent basis where found lacking.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicants' response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. D'Aurelio
Reg. No. 40,977

D'Aurelio & Mathews, LLC
96 Church Street
Chagrin Falls, Ohio 44022
Phone: (440) 729-7450
Fax: (440) 729-7465